



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,100	11/17/2003	Dick C. Hardt	SXIP-015PUS	9784
26744	7590	03/26/2008	EXAMINER	
PERLEY-ROBERTSON, HILL & MCDougall LLP 1400-340 Albert Street OTTAWA, ON K1R 0A5 CANADA			OSMAN, RAMY M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2157	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/713,100	Applicant(s) HARDT, DICK C.
	Examiner RAMY M. OSMAN	Art Unit 2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **14 December 2007**.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

\DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on December 14, 2007, where applicant amended claim 1, and cancelled claims 9-35. Claims 1-8 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant argues that Levensky fails to teach claim 1 because "*Levensky does not teach the use of an identity management system*".

In reply, Applicants use of the limitation "identity management system" is broad. Applicant has failed to explain exactly how the "identity management system" differs from the Levensky reference. Thus Applicants response amounts to a mere allegation of patentability. Levensky does teach an "identity management system" in the form of a client control program (column 4 lines 20-25). The client control program sends alias address requests (column 4 line 63 - column 5 line 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. Claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite an "address generator" for generating a pseudonymous email address. Paragraph 65 lines 6-9 of Applicants specification mention that the "generator" can be implemented as a program. Therefore a possible embodiment of the

“generator” can be a program per se, which is not directed to a process occurring as a result of executing the program on an actual physical machine. For a claim like this to be statutory, an actual hardware device is required (as in paragraph 65 lines 1-2), where the device is programmed to operate in accordance with the program in order to realize the functionality of that program. These claims do meet this criterion and are therefore deemed non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1,2,4-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levosky (US Patent No 7,054,906).

7. In reference to claim 1, Levosky teaches a pseudonymous email address generator for generating a pseudonymous email address associated with an email address, the generator comprising:

a request interface, for receiving a pseudonymous email address generation request from an identity management system (column 4 lines 20-25 and column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 20); and

a pseudonymous email address creator, for creating a pseudonymous email address associated with a mail server in response to the received pseudonymous email address

generation request (column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 5), for associating the pseudonymous email address with an email address (column 4 lines 27-32 and column 5 lines 4-20), for providing the created pseudonymous email address and its associated email address to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address (column 3 line 65 – column 4 line 3) and for providing the created pseudonymous email address to the identity management system (column 5 lines 19-25). (see also Levensky, claim 1 steps a-c)

8. In reference to claim 2, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 1 including a mail server interface for receiving from the pseudonymous email address creator both the pseudonymous email address and the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address, and for providing them to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address in a predetermined format (column 5 lines 27-48).

9. In reference to claim 4, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 1 wherein the pseudonymous email address creator includes means for defining properties of the pseudonymous email address, the properties selected from a list including a friendly name associated with the pseudonymous email address, a management link and corresponding attachment method and the email address the pseudonymous email address is associated with, and for providing the defined properties to the associated mail server (column 4 lines 25-40 and column 8 lines 35-50).

10. In reference to claim 5, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 1 further including a rules engine for defining a set of routing rules in accordance with requests received by the request interface, for associating the defined set of rules with pseudonymous email addresses generated by the pseudonymous email address creator, and for providing the created set of rules

to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address (column 7 lines 1-8 and column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

11. In reference to claim 6, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 5 wherein the rules engine further includes means for defining the routing rules in accordance with a set of parameters defined in the pseudonymous email address generation request (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

12. In reference to claim 7, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 5 wherein the rules engine further includes means for defining the routing rules in accordance with a set of default parameters (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

13. In reference to claim 8, Levensky teaches the generator of claim 7 wherein the default parameters are dependent upon a requester identifier associated with the pseudonymous email address generation request (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levensky (US Patent No 7,054,906) in view of Rounthwaite et al (US Patent Publication No 2004/0177110).**

Levosky teaches the generator of claim 1 further including a request analysis engine for receiving from the request interface an indication of the destination of the requested alias (column 8 lines 30-60). Levosky fails to explicitly teach for determining in accordance with the indication that the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address is a honeypot address. However, Rounthwaite discloses honeypot addresses for the purpose of trapping and detecting spam (¶ 72-74). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levosky by determining in accordance with the indication that the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address is a honeypot address as per the teachings of Rounthwaite for the purpose of trapping and detecting spam.

Conclusion

16. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RMO
March 14, 2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157